DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 504 95 SP 013 564

AUTHOR Houston, W. Robert; And Others
TITLE An Analysis of Extended Planning Periods for Teacher Corps Projects.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Jan 75
CONTRACT OEG-0-73-1290 (489)
NOTE 63p.; Prepared by the now-defunct Texas Professional Development Center at the University of Houston

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; Educational Finance; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Needs Assessment; Personnel Selection; *Program Design; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Program Planning; Sequential Approach; Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

The advantages and disadvantages of an extended planning period for implementing a Teacher Corps program are examined. A planning period of several months duration, four to six months for example, is deemed beneficial to the outcome of a project, while a longer period may possibly cause a loss of momentum and sense of goal. However, a planning period longer than two months provides the potential for a more effective project only if management plans formulated during proposal writing and revised during preplanning periods are monitored regularly. It is pointed out that special training opportunities should be provided as part of the planning period for program managers, and that intern recruitment should be initiated early. A set of guidelines developed for Teacher Corps Advisory Groups is presented. Appended to this report are: (1) a chronicle of study events; (2) memoranda to study team; (3) indicators of extended planing period; (4) areas to consider in assessing planning; (5) materials reviewed during the study; and (6) interview protocols. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164504

AN ANALYSIS OF EXTENDED PLANNING PERIODS FOR TEACHER CORPS PROJECTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

W. ROBERT HOUSTON
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

GENE HALL
R & D CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

WILLIAM LICATA
STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BUFFALO

January, 1975

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to Contract No. OEG-0-73-1290 (489) with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgements in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

SP013 564

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Acknowledgments

From its inception, the staff of the Iowa project was integrally involved in planning, formulating conclusions, and editing the final report of this project for completeness and accuracy. Particularly, the contributions of Dr. Paul Retish, Project Director, Mr. Roberto Leos, Associate Director, and Mr. Allan Frank, Program Development Specialist, should be recognized. They participated in every phase of the project, and should be credited for their contributions to this report.

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	
Section 1: Purpose of Study	1
Section 2: Summary of Conclusions	4
Advantages of a Longer Planning Period	4
Disadvantages of a Longer Planning Period	6
Conclusions	
Recommendations	7
Section 3: Overview: Teacher Corps Project, The University of Iowa	8
Section 4: Rationale, Data, and Basis for Conclusions	10
Advantages of a Longer Planning Period	10
Disadvantages of a Longer Planning Period	26
Recommendations	33
Section 5: Appendices	37
A. Chronicle of Study Events	37
B. Memoranda to Study Team	39
C. Indicators of Extended Planning Period	
D. Areas to Consider in Assessing Planning	45
E. Materials Reviewed During Study	51
F. Interview Protocals	52

Section 1

Purpose of Study

The funding pattern for most Teacher Corps projects has permitted less than two months between notification of funding and induction of interns into their first training experience. During 1973-74, the University of Iowa and four area school districts were granted a nine-month planning period. Following planning, interns engaged in a 15-month training program. Thus, while the total period of the grant was two years, the balance between planning and implementation was modified from typical time-lines for Teacher Corps projects.

The purpose of this study was to explore an extended planning period, to formulate advantages and disadvantages, thereby to provide a data base for decision making related to the extended planning--implementing process. The Iowa project provided information which formed the basis for this report; the study, however, was in no way an evaluation of that project.

Procedures used in the study are documented in Section 5; these paragraphs provide a brief summary. Dr. James Steffensen formulated the purpose for the study and the charge to the study team in a series of telephone conversations. On November 13, 1974, he met with Robert Houston, principal investigator of the study, and Paul Retish, Director of the Iowa Teacher Corps project, to discuss procedures for the study (see appendix A for a schedule of project activities).

In the following weeks, several telephone conversations and one conference call were held by members of the study team and the Iowa Teacher Corps project staff.

Documents and memoranda were exchanged (Appendices B and E). A set of indicators that one might expect to find in more extensively planned projects was formulated to provide direction for study procedures (Appendix C). Areas of focus for the project were identified (Appendix D). These two analyses (Appendices C and D) formed the basis for designing data collection procedures and interview protocals. Interviews were scheduled with all constituency groups--interns, team leaders, principals, superintendents, LEA coordinator, college faculty and administrators, and Teacher Corps management team. For each of these groups, interview protocals were designed to guide date gathering (Appendix F).

The study team visited Iowa on December 16 and 17, 1974. During the previous evening a final planning session was held by the study team and Teacher Corps staff. Following interviews in Iowa City with University faculty and administrators, three sites were visited--Davenport, Muscatine, and West Liberty. Teachers, interns, principals, superintendents, and community representatives were interviewed (Appendix B includes a schedule of interviews). In all, 62 people were interviewed as part of the data collection process.

From the interviews and from our own experiences with similiar projects, the study team and the Iowa Teacher Corps staff formulated the basic conclusions of this study. A draft of the final report was written and circulated to insure accuracy and comprehensiveness, edited, then published in this form.

This report has been organized and written in a form that will hopefully facilitate the reader's use of the information and conclusions. The report is organized into the following sections.

Section 2 summarizes advantages, disadvantages, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. Supporting data and rationales for these are found in Section 4.

Section 3 outlines briefly the scope and thrusts of the Iowa Teacher Corps project.

Section 5 specifies procedures used in the study, including (a) a chronicle of events which occurred in the study, (b) memoranda from Robert Houston to Study Team and from Paul Retish to Study Team, (c) list of indicators of more effectively planned programs, (d) list of areas to consider in interviewing role groups; (e) list of materials reviewed by the Study Team; and (f) interview protocals used in the study for each of the following role groups: University faculty, University Dean and Associate Dean, Project Administrators, Teacher Corps Team Leaders, Interns, School Teachers and Principals, and Community Representatives.

Section 2

Summary of Conclusions

This section summarizes the conclusions of the study. Each is discussed in greater detail in Section 4. Conclusions are numbered in parallel fashion so that the reader readily may identify and read the expanded versions. These are organized into four parts. The first summarizes the advantages of having an extended planning period, while the second part delineates disadvantages. Conclusions are then formulated. The last part is concerned with recommendations derived from the study.

ADVANTAGES OF A LONGER PLANNING PERIOD

Several advantages accrue to a project because of an extended planning period. These are listed below.

		Reference
1.0	An opportunity is provided to conceptualize a more relevant and innovative program.	(Page 10)
2.0	Input can be obtained for the program and its operation from a wider variety of sources.	(Page 12)
3.0	Program design, development, and implementation do not need to be carried out simultaneously.	(Page 13)
4.0	Evaluation plans, models, and instrumentation can be developed prior to program implementation.	(Page 14)
5.0	The opportunity is increased to develop school/university/community trust, commitment and involvement in the program.	(Page 15)
6.0	The Advisory Committee has time to develop the necessary capability to work effectively through problems.	(Page 16)
7.0	Time is provided to anticipate and work out administrative problems concerned with the project before the problems become crises during program operation.	(Page 18)

8.0 Schedules based on detailed planning can be adjusted and revised prior to intern arrival. (Page 19)

9.0 Institutional change is facilitated by involving regular faculty rather than new or part time people. (Page 20)

10.0 Time is provided to define roles within project commitments and plans, advertise jobs widely, and select personnel more carefully. (Page 21)

11.0 Time is provided for staff development prior to intern training and to plan for continuing staff inservice education. (Page 22)

12.0 The experiences, materials, and resources of similar projects are more likely to be used as resources in the planning period. (Page 22)

13.0 Interns may be recruited from a wider geographic area and provided more definitive program information prior to selection, thus leading to a more effective selection process. (Page 23)

DISADVANTAGES OF A LONGER PLANNING PERIOD

Extending a project time line to provide for a longer period for planning results in several factors negatively related to the project's success. These are listed in this section.

		Reference
1.0	Staff who are not formally assigned to the project but expected to be involved in the planning have strong competing demands for their time.	(Page 26)
2.0	Planning often is not viewed as a legitimate part of the university reward system.	(Page 27)
3.0	Planning activities receive a low priority when compared with regular operations and teaching.	(Page 27)
4.0	If a two-year funding period is assumed for a project, then lengthening the planning time decreases the time interns are being trained.	(Page 28)
5.0	A long period between plans and implementation may decrease motivation and productivity.	(Page 29)
6.0	Extended planning costs more.	(Page 30)
7.0	Institutional conditions related to the program may drastically change during an extended planning period, thereby requiring shifts in the design and operation of the program.	(Page 30)
8.0	The potential for conflict between those faculty with released time and those without released time increases.	(Page 31)
9.0	Expectations for the program with an extended planning period may be unrealistically high.	(Page 31)

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the evidence garnered in the project, the study team drew several conclusions relative to extending the period for project planning. These six conclusions are found below.

1) An extended planning period definitely affords the opportunity to significantly increase the innovativeness and impact of a Teacher Corps Program.

2) Without tight and knowledgable program management, little will be accomplished by an extended planning period.

3) A nine-month planning period may be too long while two months compacts the process to such an extent that human interaction is neglected.

4) All of the key program members should have budgeted time for planning, and concomitant responsibility for implementing these plans. This includes both the university and school faculty.

5) An extended planning period should be required of all Teacher Corp Programs that are being funded for the first time.

6) Institutions that have had previous Teacher Corp Programs may not require as extended a planning period unless they are embarking on entirely new ventures, with new partners, or other extenuating factors which would require special long-range planning attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations are made.

		Reference
1.0	An extended planning period provides the potential for a more effective project only if management plans which were formulated during proposal writing and revised during preplanning and planning periods are monitored regularly.	(Page 33)
2.0	Special training opportunities should be provided as a part of the planning period for program managers (Director, Assistant Director, Program Development Specialist).	(Page 34)
3.0	Intern recruitment should be initiated early in the planning period.	(Page 35)

Section 3

Overview
Teacher Corps Project, The University of Iowa

Roberto Leos

The University of Iowa Teacher Corps project began with a nine-month planning period on August 27, 1973. During the planning stage (August 27, 1973 to May 31, 1974), Teacher Corps faculty and staff developed an instructional system in a competency-based format. Interns and Team Leaders were recruited during the planning stage with final selection made in May, 1974.

Criteria for selection of Interns were:

1) bilingualism (Spanish-English);
2) approximately 70 transferable semester hours; and
3) willingness to commit time and energy to community projects, practicum experience, and attainment of a University of Iowa degree in Elementary Education with Certification.

Team Leaders were selected on the basis of:

1) recommendation by supervisors (principals, superintendents); and
2) interview by Teacher Corps selection committee.

The Preservice period began on June 3, 1974. During Preservice, the Interns were involved in:

1) completing those courses required by the University of Iowa for graduation; and
2) undertaking a sequence of Teacher Corps modules to complete the selection process. No interns were deselected.

During August, 1974, the Interns moved into their assigned communities. In two communities, orientation activities were the primary responsibility of the Community Coordinators. Two of the communities, West Liberty and Muscatine, do not have Community Coordinators. In these towns, the Team Leaders took most of the responsibility for orientation activities.

Inservice began on August 19, 1974, with the Interns and Team Leaders participating in the various pre-school meetings with each school district. The Interns were assigned to several elementary schools in Muscatine, Davenport, West Liberty and Columbus Junction, Iowa. Each Intern worked both in the lower elementary grades (K-3) and the upper grades (4-6). An example of the fall assignments for 16 weeks is as follows.

During the first eight weeks, the Interns were assigned to one of the grades K-3 on a half-day basis. For the second eight weeks, the Intern then was assigned to one of the grades 4-6 on a half-day basis.

During the spring semester, the Intern will be given the opportunity to select a community and grade preference. The first eight weeks of the spring semester will also be on a half-day basis. The last eight weeks will be a full-day practicum situation.

The University instruction began in September on a twice weekly basis. A location central to the four communities and Iowa City was chosen for instruction. The Intern and faculty traveled to the L. L. Pickett School in Muscatine on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The instruction was entirely field-based with no instruction provided on the campus of The University of Iowa. All modules were designed in a competency-based format.

Section 4

Rationale, Data, and Basis for Conclusions

ADVANTAGES OF A LONGER PLANNING PERIOD

1.0 An opportunity is provided to conceptualize a more relevant and innovative program.

A major purpose of Teacher Corps is to improve the preparation of teachers to work with the unique needs of children from low income families. This mandate requires new and more relevant training programs for interns. It requires new consortia among schools, communities, teachers, and universities. It requires new materials, new management structures and instructional techniques, new ways for faculties of schools and colleges to interact, new perspectives of societal and school needs, and new concepts of relevancy.

Such radical changes, called for by the increasingly rapid cultural changes pervading America today and the decreasing relevancy of basic institutions, cannot be attained by patchwork approaches to changing teacher preparation programs. Needed today are vital programs which have been totally conceptualized, based on the needs of children and youth, and tailored to the current status, motivations, and needs of prospective and inservice educators.

Designers and program implementors should make clear their assumptions or beliefs about (a) the place of schools in society, (b) the role of teachers and interns in schools, (c) the thrusts of the teacher education program,

(d) factors which facilitate student learning, (e) constraints placed on project programs, and (f) major goals for the project with respect to institutional change and program dimensions. Designing a program which incorporates these features and thus has internal consistency and product validity takes time.

When people are involved who previously have not worked closely together, discussions surrounding these issues take time. Collecting data that are basic to the program design takes time (needs assessments of low-income families, needs of schools, and contribution of project). Specifying basic program components and determining explicit objectives takes more time, yet this is not effectively completed without general agreement on assumptions for the program. Developing materials for the training program, designing a relevant management system, and devising appropriate evaluation strategies are other factors to be included in the design process.

Because the design of an integrated, tailored, relevant program does require extensive resources (time, emotional energy, etc.), many programs have only slightly modified current programs rather than undertake major revisions. Teacher Corps programs are supported in this decision by the short time available between funding announcement and program implementation. Yet such a practice precludes the development of a truly innovative and up-to-date program; it encourages continuation of former programs. It also discourages special-purpose programs such as those designed to meet the needs of bilingual, bicultural students.

This should not be interpreted as meaning that current programs are not effective in any area; only that from time to time a new perspective

should be employed to insure relevancy and cohesiveness. Programs which evolve over time include major duplications and gaps. When the Iowa faculty shared objectives and instructional strategies during the planning period, they found instances where the same concepts were repeated 2 and 3 times in the program. They also found important concepts that were not even part of the program--everyone assumed someone else was teaching them. Further, the general competencies provided support and background for more specific, subject related competencies, and for integrating the program to a greater extent by providing continuity.

A final point--program design, at least theoretically, should precede design of plans for management, recruitment of interns, and development of materials. In a short time-span, too many activities must be concurrently carried out, leaving many loose ends and uncoordinated pieces.

2.0 Input can be obtained for the program and its operation from a wider variety of sources.

Programs in teacher preparation have often been formulated primarily on the basis of university faculty perception of what is important. Some feedback data from students, both formal and informal, have been employed. But the programs could use data from various educational constituencies and potentially improve the outcome. These constituencies include parents and community representatives, teachers, administrators, professional associations, and college faculty and administrators. Their varied perspectives provide important data for the program.

A needs assessment of target schools in the training program can provide data for program design. For example, in a program oriented

toward preparing Chicano teachers, the assessment could include data on the extensiveness and number of Chicano students, extent of English language fluency, drop-out rate, employment patterns, community perceived needs, and effectiveness of relations between teachers and community. Such data can and should form the basis for the program.

University faculty, with many demands on their time, become separated from the current environment in schools. A cooperative venture provides the way and need for them to interact with schools and community. Iowa University faculty who attended community meetings where school programs, Chicano needs, and teacher education were discussed, indicated that they had learned much and were modifying their programs as a result. Unfortunately, not everyone has the opportunity or avails himself of the the opportunity to participate in community-school meetings.

3.0 Program design, development, and implementation do not need to be carried out simultaneously.

When the time-line prior to implementation is short, development and implementation are almost simultaneous. Materials are prepared today for use tomorrow. In this setting, a total conception is not possible. Neither is it possible to try out and revise materials prior to their use with interns.

More creative approaches to instruction often require additional time to design. Materials must be secured or developed, ideas and multiple options specified, and the entire process conceived prior to implementation. With the pressure of immediate implementation, staff are more likely to return to existing or readily available materials rather than to design or seek out new materials.

The pressure of immediate needs of students overshadows the larger need for design. The old saying still holds: When you are up to your elbows in alligators, you forget that your job was to drain the swamp.

4.0 Evaluation plans, models, and instrumentation can be developed prior to program implementation.

Evaluation includes both formative and summative processes; with the latter often becoming the major tool as the project is evaluated at the end of the funding period. Perhaps more vital is the need for formative evaluation. Formative evaluation provides feedback as the program progresses toward achievement of goals, and suggests areas for attention.

With a longer planning period, the design for evaluation can be instituted early and used as a basis for shaping the program. All too often, programs flounder because of a lack of direction and feedback on the progress toward goals.

Evaluation refers here to program evaluation, governance-management evaluation, Intern evaluation, and the planning-process itself. Guidelines for determining progress toward project goals need to be established early and practiced continually.

Research requiring pre- and post-testing or matching groups as part of an experimental process must be designed prior to interns beginning the program. Adequate research designs require time to formulate and plan prior to implementation. When the planning period is compressed into a few weeks, the more immediate needs for organizing the project and preparing for interns takes precedence over longer-range research--yet the latter may have the greatest payoff for education in the long run.

Continuity between the designing and planning stages of the project and the implementation stage is important. In Iowa, a graduate assistant responsible for evaluation design graduated, leaving implementation to another individual. Because the project evaluator knew he would not be responsible for implementation, designs were general rather than specific, and they were not tailored to the particular programatic needs of the project. Implementation during the second year required reconceptualization and the loss of power provided through pre-planned evaluation.

5.0 The opportunity is increased to develop school/university/community trust, commitment and involvement in the program.

In nearly all instances there is a history of distrust and felt abuse in the relationships between schools and universities. Schools see universities as being aloof, and presenting a stance of being superior and more knowledgable in their contacts with schools. The university faculty is viewed as having little practical reality in their approach to teaching. Based on past experiences, the schools are apt to be leary of new initiatives by university educators.

Distrust and extreme caution are even further intensified by the past experiences of minorities within the community. Chicanos, blacks, native Americans, and others have been ignored and openly used in past contacts with schools. The university is even further removed from their lives.

Building effective bridges between these institutions, groups, and individuals requires the creation of a continuous cycle of reaching out for their input and providing feedback to show that their proposals have been heard and incorporated into the developing program. Particularly for new projects, establishing and implementing this cyclic process requires extended time. Building a genuine partnership based on open communica-

tion and trust and having this partnership working before the interns arrive requires time for real commitment to be demonstrated and for all involved to believe in the genuineness of the collaborative effort.

5.0 The Advisory Committee has time to develop the necessary capability to work effectively through problems.

Each institution and constituency which has an active role in a Teacher Corps program exhibits an extensive array of values, competing needs, and interests. Each has its own primary mission--instruction of children and youth by schools, instruction of adults by universities, and value continuity by community institutions. Resolving areas of conflict within each of these institutions and groups is a challenging and time-consuming activity. The Advisory Committee, representing all of them, provides the viable way for articulating project thrusts and communicating these to the various constitutencies. A Teacher Corps program is a multi-institutional effort requiring the sharing of resources, open and effective communication, and working together to solve problems that demand the capability to make quick decisions by the Advisory Committee.

Finding and recruiting individuals who can ably and with credibility represent each of the institutions and groups that should have input through the Advisory Committee is another time-consuming task. To work together most effectively, time should be available for them to understand each other and to develop communication skills.

A bonus from having more time to function as a committee during an extended planning period is the early identification of individuals who do not have the time or interest to serve and to replace them with a minimum of disturbance or shifts in procedures. With an extended planning period,

more representative and effective individuals can be recruited as members of the Advisory Committee.

A set of guidelines suggested by J. Cecil Parker[1] appears to be relevant to Teacher Corps Advisory groups and to those planning for and working with them.

Guideline	I	People work as individuals and as members of groups on problems that are significant to them.
Guideline	II	The same people who work on problems formulate goals and plan how they will work.
Guideline	III	Many opportunities are developed for people to relate themselves to each other.
Guideline	IV	Continuous attention is given to individual and to group problem-solving processes.
Guideline	V	Atmosphere is created that is conducive to building mutual respect, support, permissiveness and creativeness.
Guideline	VI	Multiple and rich resources are made available and used.
Guideline	VII	The simplest possible means are developed to move through decisions to action.
Guideline	VIII	Constant encouragement is present to test and to try ideas and plans in real situations.
Guideline	IX	Appraisal is made an integral part of in-service activities.
Guideline	X	Continuous attention is given to the interrelationship of different groups.
Guideline	XI	The facts of individual differences among members of each group are accepted and utilized.
Guideline	XII	Activities are related to pertinent aspects of the current educational, cultural, political and economic scene.

[1] Parker, J. Cecil, "Guidelines For In-Service Education"

<u>In-Service Education For Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators</u> Fifty-sixth Yearbook, NSSE, Part 1, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1957) pp. 103-128.

Developing the capacity to work as a policy decision, communication, and facilitation group necessitates their learning about and assisting in the many aspects of program development and implementation. Only then will the Advisory Committee be able to handle quickly and effectively the thorny problems that arise throughout the planning period and during operation of the Teacher Corps Program.

7.0 Time is provided to anticipate and work out administrative problems concerned with a project before the problems become crises during program operation.

When there is a very limited time available for planning and tooling up to operate a Teacher Corps program, many administrative problems that can be deferred are postponed until later. This is done not because of a lack of understanding of their importance, but rather because more pressing coordination and logistics tasks must be accomplished before the interns arrive.

With an extended planning period, as has been demonstrated by the University of Iowa Teacher Corps, many administrative tasks, such as transfer of intern course credit from other colleges, negotiations with the Registrar about course credit, grade reporting procedures, and fiscal agent budgeting procedures can be satisfactorily worked out well in advance of the interns arrival.

The consequences of having these details worked out in advance are many. For example, the interns arrive already knowing what course credit has been transferred from other Universities. Stipend and expense checks can be paid on schedule and the Teacher Corps staff is better able to function as a stable force with the program under control, rather than being in the midst of

intra-crises decision-making with all the confusion, uncertainty and ambiguity associated with such a process.

8.0 Schedules based on detailed planning can be adjusted and revised prior to intern arrival.

By having an extended planning period, those involved with a Teacher Corps program have the opportunity to analyze their planned activities, to estimate time and other requirements, and to predict consequences. With limited planhing time, the first plan of action is likely to be implemented; there is too little time for further exploration, thought, reflection, and coordination with others. With the intense pressure of limited planning time, many points of view may not be expressed and thoroughly considered.

Having additional time during the planning period builds in the opportunity to make adjustments and revisions in operational procedures during the training program. This time allows for adjustments to be made with the emerging realities rather than attempting to operationalize the idealized program that was described when the proposal was written.

This time for revision is especially critical in being able to obtain and use input from the community. Having time to build trust with the community, and to report back to them about changes made as a result of their input, is vital in establishing and maintaining a working partnership.

Needs assessment data particularly related to the project as well as more general community, school, and university data can be collected and used as a basis for making changes during the planning period. This will result in the operational program being more realistic and relevant as well as increasing the sharing of ownership of the program.

9.0 Institutional change is facilited by involving regular faculty rather than new and part time people.

When projects are funded with short lead-times to implementation, administrators have difficulty freeing senior faculty from other responsibilities. This can lead to temporary appointments of faculty with less competence or commitment to the Teacher Corps program. Also, outside, "soft money," or temporary faculty are less influential in bringing about institutional change. The ramifications of this include decreased credibility with schools and community, less likelihood of directly effecting the on-going program practices in the university, and increased uncertainty and misunderstandings within the Teacher Corps program. Regular university faculty probably are already known and recognized as being part of the composite social system.

Additional bonuses are obtained by having regular faculty in Teacher Corps. Their involvement demonstrates that the university places a high priority on Teacher Corps. They, in turn, can become advocates of Teacher Corps in their departments. Through departmental work, they can increase awareness and the likehood of Teacher Corps innovative practices being adopted or adapted by other faculty and programs within the university.

As a further support to institutional change, the releasing of regular faculty frees faculty salary dollars that can be used to extend related innovative efforts. For example, at The University of Iowa, three part-time faculty assigned to Teacher Corps released the equivalent of one full-time equivalent faculty position in the Special Education Department budget. A creative Ph. D. was employed full-time on this FTE to bring additional

insights and ideas to both the Special Education Department and the Teacher Corps program.

10.0 Time is provided to define roles within project commitments and plans, advertise jobs widely, and select personnel more carefully.

The successful achievement of the goals established by a Teacher Corps project relies heavily on the staff and personnel associated with that program. The criteria and process used for staff selection must be given very careful consideration. Planning time allows an opportunity to establish these criteria and makes it possible to obtain input from all parties to be affected by those selected. Judgements can be based on needs rather than immediate availability of individuals.

Team leaders, for example, could not only be selected by reviewing credentials, but by being observed in a classroom situation, interacting with pupils, supporting staff and administration. Community feedback on teacher effectiveness and acceptance by parents can be determined through interviews and observation.

Lead time affords time to advertise and articulate an innovative program which makes prospective job candidates feel that association with this project is synonymous with career advancement. Prospective job candidates would be more motivated to apply and become part of this program.

Personnel could be recruited who have credibility in the schools and community. Skills and personalities of potential staff could be matched to complement each other. Further, staff selection could more effectively contribute to the institutions long-range goals. For example, training team leaders for Teacher Corps provides a new cadre of supervisors and administrators for the district. This could also have similar effect on college staff.

11.0 Time is provided for staff development prior to intern training and to plan for continuing staff inservice education.

A critical aspect of any program where interpersonnel relationships exist is that of communication--communication related to program goals as well as staff roles in achieving those goals. Clarity of role definitions and openness of communication helps reduce many mixed messages which eventually can lead to mistrust and misunderstandings. Staff inservice education is one means of improving programs.

Inservice education for staff can focus on several areas of need during a planning period. Human relations training can set the atmosphere for better communications and decision making; team building can take place; participants can articulate their philosophy and how it coincides or differs with the goals of the program. During the planning period, opportunities for targeted input from conferences can be drawn on. Participants at national or regional conferences on CBTE, alternative schools, mainstreaming, or training complexes can more effectively participate because they have a background for the conference and a need to gain specific ideas from it. The project, too, is likely to benefit from conference remarks that take on new meaning because of the new context. What is learned and read becomes a part of the program and the acquired expertise is used to establish new skills.

12.0 The experiences, materials, and resources of similar projects are more likely to be used as resources in the planning period.

Other Teacher Corps projects can provide valuable insights to new ventures. Traditionally, interaction with other project personnel comes

too late--after one is well into his own program. Planning time provides the opportunity to obtain materials from other projects, R & D centers, and other sources (e.g., ERIC, catalogs, state education departments). With additional time, these materials can be identified, reviewed and, if necessary, revised to fit the needs of the project. If a workshop or consultant could assist in material use and skill development, then the lead time is available for arranging this. Time is also available to think of alternative modes, rather than a quick rehash of what has been done in the past.

Such a practice eliminates duplication and leads to more effective instruction. Community, school, and college staff may be attempting to develop materials, define goals, or write modules which are already available and could easily be used in the program.

13.0 Interns may be recruited from a wider geographic area and provided more definitive program information prior to selection, thus leading to a more effective selection process.

One of the most important phases of any project is intern selection. The recruiting process should include input from all constituents (community, college, school) as the profile of the type of student to be recruited is specified.

These criteria help to determine the quality of students and provide the opportunity to acquaint community with the intensity and amount of screening which takes place prior to acceptance. A wide array of persons may be involved in interviews and other screening mechanisms.

Planning time affords the opportunity to evaluate transcripts, check whether degrees have been confirmed, hold personal interviews, widen the range of locations for recruiting, and receive recommendations prior to acceptance. Much of the paperwork leading to program acceptance can be systematically completed.

Because interns are not recruited at the same time the program is being designed, more specific information can be given them. They, in turn, have more data for making their decisions. In Iowa, prospective interns received what they referred to as the "green book" which outlined the program and administrative procedures. Such a book was the result of many hours of negotiations related to the project; it was more than a set of paragraphs--it synthesized programmatic decisions.

Interns often are engaged in other activities at the time they apply and are accepted. Some are in schools and others employed. Typically, they have about two weeks between notification of their acceptance and time to report for training. This severely limits their responsiveness, particularly when a cross-country move is involved.

Sending potential interns and early notification of acceptance is not an easy task. Iowa received lists of potential interns in January, 1974 from Teacher Corps recruitment centers and contacted many in February about their interest in the project. Interns were recruited primarily from the California Center, with some through local contacts. Correspondence and telephone calls with prospective interns clarified many questions, yet it was May 1 before personal interviews were held with persons from California, and two weeks later before they were notified of acceptance. This time line

might have been shortened, and more wide-spread recruitment achieved, had Iowa been able to draw from all recruitment center and been able to respond to intern applications more quickly.

DISADVANTAGES OF HAVING AN EXTENDED PLANNING PERIOD

1.0 Staff who are not formally assigned to the project but expected to be involved in the planning have strong competing demands for their time.

To have maximal involvement and awareness of the program planning effort, key university and school faculty and administrators are encouraged to join the planning effort. Often individuals become heavily involved in the planning period although they have no formally assigned time.

Some university faculty may be able to sandwich this in with other formally assigned duties. However, sooner or later, most faculty find themselves in a position of having more work to do than they can accomplish. When this happens, either their input and representation will be lost to the planning effort or their careers within their departments may be placed in jeopardy. Further, there is no assurance that they would be assigned later for the operational phase of the program. This leads to hesitation on the part of some to become involved.

Obtaining extensive input from school faculty and administrators is even more complex. For university faculty, a part of their professional recognition and reward comes from being associated with an innovative program, related publications, and travel. School personnel, however, have as their primary mission the education of children. Involvement in planning an innovative teacher education program typically is viewed as a secondary priority.

If school personnel do not have direct assignments with compensation, their involvement may be almost impossible to maintain. There are too many other demands on their time. Irrespective of direct compensation, school

personnel will not continue to participate unless they feel that their input is being used.

2.0 Planning often is not viewed as a legitimate part of the university reward system.

Planning is a process that entails spending many hours in meetings, visiting with university faculty, school administrators and teachers, going out in the community and meeting with individuals and small groups. Planning activities do not result in a product that can be counted or weighed on a scale.

All of the necessary and time consuming activities that are part of planning are terribly difficult to evaluate and relate to a faculty member's salary and promotion. Because of this, many faculty are unable to justify the spending of their time in any extended planning activities. Time here takes away from traditional activities related to advancement.

3.0 Planning activities receive a low priority when compared with the regular operations and teaching.

During a planning period, the activities can easily be delayed as the requirements and crises of the individual's regular work increase. For example, if a class size becomes large enough to require dividing, the faculty member assigned to planning may be recruited to teach the second class.

Some administrators view extended planning as nonproductive because it draws the faculty member away from his work. A more smoothly running program, which is the consequence of extended planning, is not often correlated back to the planning that was done. Thus, there is little rein-

forcement to place a higher priority on planning.

4.0 <u>If a two-year funding period is assumed for a project, then lengthening the planning time decreases the time interns are being trained.</u>

Little discussion is needed for this disadvantage; however, consideration might be given to providing an added period for more extended planning as a part of the first program funding. Resultant cycles of the same program with the same staff should not need as long a planning period. In that way intern time could be held constant and the priority value given to initial extended planning is further emphasized.

The training period for interns in Iowa was shortened by the same length of time as the planning time was extended. Thus the question is--to what extent does this affect intern training? Interns in Iowa consistently noted the pressure they were under in completing a degree program in a shorter time frame. They pointed out heavy credit-hour loads and extensive assignments in addition to school experiences as an intern. Some felt that a few additional months in the training cycle would have been helpful. To what extent all interns feel overworked regardless of the length or location of the program was not considered herein; it might be a rather universal phenomena.

Time in planning helps avoid problems in implementation because of increased lead time. But implementation is consequently shortened. Learning complex skills and changing attitudes which are stressed in Teacher Corps training efforts requires time. The study team could not determine whether intern change or institutional change was being adversely affected by a shorter implementation period.

Cost per intern-training-month for a project is increased. During implementation, the per month costs of training interns are less expensive than if no planning period had been undertaken. Therefore, when additional planning costs are added to implementation costs, the total per month of implementation-training is greater than if a very brief planning period were involved. This study, however, did not attempt to compute the differences or determine per intern costs of the project.

5.0 A long period between plans and implementation may decrease motivation and productivity.

Due to the pressure of other activities and the remoteness of pressure from interns who do not begin training for 4 - 6 months, faculty are not apt to be as productive in planning. To maintain productivity, faculty need positive reinforcement and direct feedback about their planning effort. Tasks, due dates, and decision points need to be established, and when need be, pressure exerted to insure that the work is accomplished. The consequent slowed productivity results in unpreparedness for the arrival of the interns.

The benefits of a longer planning period can readily be lost through lack of staff productivity. On several occasions the Iowa faculty referred to the leisurely approach to decisions during planning and the benefits of such an approach, yet this can also be a problem. Several referred specifically and with pride to one set of decisions that had to be made by a specific deadline, and the extra effort they expended to meet the deadline.

Planning and decision making seem to consume as much time and resources as will be devoted to them. Unless pressed to bring closure on decision

issues, decisions are not made and products will not be completed. In late October 1973, the Associate Dean advised the faculty that he would not proceed with negotiating any arrangements about the assignment of grades until the planning group had determined how competence, modules, and courses interrelated. The faculty had three days to finish the task. They finished and reported that they would have dragged on much longer without the insistence of the Associate Dean. By using time related management techniques, a series of short, succinct timelines can lead to a more effective project. Without continuous close monitoring, deciding how to accomplish a task will consume the production time and resources as well.

6.0 Extended planning costs more.

Having personnel and resources assigned to extended planning is a real expense above and beyond operating the actual program. Just exactly how much planning and how much duration is desirable is a debatable question. There must be a point of diminishing returns. Determining this point must be closely related to such variables as program manager skill, experience and capability of the faculty, schools and community, and the relative degree of innovations of the proposed program. Combining these variables in a formula that will yield an estimate of the amount of payoff for planning dollars is an interesting evaluation question that should be pursued.

7.0 Institutional conditions related to the program may drastically change during an extended planning period, thereby requiring shifts in the design and operation of the program.

During an extended planning period, such things as certification

requirements and organization patterns may be changed. There are also apt to be changes of Superintendents, Deans, teachers, and community representatives. These ongoing changes may seriously effect the planning process and the design of the subsequent operational program.

Many of these changes cannot be anticipated; they are just the random events of time. The longer the planning period the more likely is the occurrence of one of these random events that will require making major changes in the plan program.

8.0 The potential for conflict between those faculty with released time and those without released time increases.

Faculty without released time are involved only by "taking it out of the hide." They are apt to develop resentment toward other faculty who have support to work on the project. The resultant hostility can lead to conflicts and a decline in everyone's productivity. Non-supported faculty are apt to believe that they are doing more work on the project than many of those that are supported. Attending to this potential problem is critical if conflict is to be avoided.

9.0 Expectations for the program with an extended planning period may be unrealistically high.

Just because there is an opportunity for extended planning does not mean that the resultant program will be flawless and have exceptionally high outcomes. Many of the crisis points should be anticipated and solving problems should be more easily accomplished. Expectations of all involved should be more realistic; however, unless a deliberate attempt is made to hold expectations in line, many will assume that a Utopian program will be the immediate results of extended planning.

During planning, people tend to speak of dreams; in implementation they talk of frustrations. The incongruence between the two leads to higher expectations than are realistic and potentially greater dissatisfaction with results.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of specific recommendations are imbedded in the advantages and disadvantages sections, however, several are of such concern as to be included herein.

1.0 An extended planning period provides the potential for a more effective project only if management plans which were formulated during proposal writing and revised during preplanning and planning periods are monitored regularly.

With a broader goal of institutional change and demonstration of innovations, projects require a more extensive planning period than the typical two months provided Teacher Corps projects. Interinstitutional planning and decisioning, particularly with crucial issues, requires time for interaction; accelerating the process often increases the pressure for immediate decisions with little opportunity to verbalize concerns.

It is possible, however, for planning periods to lead to little action. Action steps are not so immediate; tough decisions can be put off until tomorrow or until someone else can be involved.

When the planning period is long, meetings tend to be spaced farther apart. Decisions are made and remade. Participants must learn to work together with each new session. There is some lost motion. Motivation becomes less and less when the results of decisions are to occur far in the future.

The study team felt a planning period of several months duration (4 - 6) would be very beneficial to the outcome of a project. They were not certain, however, that nine months was needed. Perhaps a pre-project period of 2-3

months after announcement of funding and prior to the beginning of actual project activities would provide the lead time for assemblying the project staff. Anticipation of a beginning date provides readiness for a vigorous project start; a strong beginning often motivates participants to more effective action.

Well conceived plans are typically part of project proposals. During planning and implementation, however, these are typically modified due to unforeseen circumstances. In some cases little attempt is made by project managers to maintain the schedule of activities. In other instances, they have less control over circumstances than projected. They may have misjudged and been overly optimistic about the rapidity with which change can be accomplished.

Management tools are used in many Teacher Corps projects--PERT charts, Gantt charts, management by objectives strategies. These should be continued, holding the project responsible for involving all parties in the planning period and providing a process for montoring project check points, reviewing changes in plans, and approving them. Such a process would be beneficial both to the project and to the funding agency.

2.0 Special training opportunities should be provided as part of the planning period for program managers (Director, Assistant Director, Program Development Specialist).

The success of a project depends in large measure on the ability and innovativeness of the managers. A variety of training opportunities, including conferences, project visitations, individualized training systems, and consultants should be made available to them. Key resource people

could be drawn from those involved in previous training efforts as well as in related R & D efforts. Efficiency of operation strongly suggests that previous experience be considered as a major criterion for employment of managers. Further, such training should be extended to other project personnel.

New projects (expecially in isolated areas) need technical assistance during the planning as well as inservice phase. Management training could be initiated with intensive workshops which would systematically take new directors through the budget, guidelines, and general management procedures. A liaison/type relationship should be established between the personnel from a newly funded project and those from one or more projects that have been in existance for more than one cycle. This practice would provide field-based experience for inexperienced personnel. The project managers should be given a choice of programs with which to communicate and work. The process is now proving to be helpful where established networks exist. Assistance should be in line with project priorities; i.e. bilingual, diagnostic, prescriptive, mainstreaming, program management, evaluation, change, program design, etc.

3.0 Intern recruitment should be initiated early in the planning period.

Too often, projects want to get organized before they interact with other agencies or institutions and before they begin recruitment. Interns, on the other hand, are pressed into an untenably short time frame for making decisions and reordering their lives. They do it, but they often are not happy to do so. "I applied, waited months to hear, was selected and given two weeks to quit my job, move, and get settled." Iowa was able to contact interns initially in February because of their longer planning period.

Considerable correspondence, telephone calls, and other contacts between the project and prospective interns were made prior to personal interviews. While other factors such as recruitment center practices and funding patterns precluded Iowa from selecting interns before the middle of May, the process could have been expedited, leading to earlier intern selection.

A longer period for selection provides for a more rigorous recruitment process and the potential for bringing interns from a wider geographic area together. Better quality interns and less parochialism are potential results.

Appendix A

CHRONICLE OF STUDY EVENTS

November 1, 1974 - Study requested and outlined by James Steffensen, Teacher Corps.

November 14, 1974 - Conference in St. Louis between James Steffensen; Paul Retish, Iowa Teacher Corps Director; and Robert Houston, Chairman of the Study Team. Iowa project described, procedures for study specified.

November 14, 1974 - Conference in St. Louis between Paul Collins and Robert Houston to identify potential members of study team.

November 20, 1974 - Composition of study team finalized in telephone conversation between James Steffensen and Robert Houston.

November 25, 1974 - Study team members contacted and agreed to serve on team.

November 27, 1974 - Conference telephone call between Paul Retish, Robert Houston, Gene Hall, and William Licata. Procedures for the study, arrangements for housing, and interview schedules discussed.

December 9-13, 1974 - Series of telephone calls on specific site visit arrangements.

December 15, 1974 - Conference in Iowa City preceeding interviews. Present were Paul Retish, Roberto Leos, Assistant Project Director, Allan Frank, Program Development Specialist, Gene Hall, and Robert Houston. Procedures and schedules for first interview day discussed; last minute details completed.

December 16, 1974 - 9:00-11:00 - Two separate conferences with University of Iowa Faculty.

Gene Hall with: Program Development Specialist, Elementary education faculty member, secondary education faculty member, educational psychologist, counselor educator, language arts specialist.

Bob Houston with: Project Director, Assistant Project Director, social studies professor, mathematics education professor, special education--generic competencies specialist, project evaluator--graduate assistant.

December 16, 1974 (continued) - 11:00-11:30 - Houston, Hall, Retish conference with College of Education Dean Howard Jones and Associate Dean Ray Muston.

Davenport Visit (Houston)

1:30-3:00 - Four interns, Team Leader, and LEA Coordinator, Project Director.

3:00-4:00 - Two principals, two cooperating teachers, LEA Coordinator, Elementary Education Director, Superintendent of Muscatine-Scott County School System, Project Director.

4:00-5:00 - Team Leader, two parents who are members of the Advisory Committee, Project Director.

Muscatine Visit (Hall)

1:30-3:00 - Six interns, Team Leader, Program Development Specialist.

3:00-4:30 - Superintendent, four cooperating teachers, two principals, Team Leader, Program Development Specialist.

West Liberty (Licate)

1:30-3:00 - Six interns, two team leaders, Assistant Director.

3:00-4:45 - Seven cooperating teachers, three principals, Superintendent, Community Coordinator.

7:00-10:30 p.m. - Preliminary findings and recommendations completed. Present were Robert Houston, Gene Hall, William Licata, Paul Retish, Roberto Leos, and Allan Frank.

December 17, 1974 - Study team discussion and drafting of parts of report.

December 17-28, 1974 - First draft of report written.

December 30, 1974 - Draft circulated by Robert Houston to William Licata, Gene Hall, and Paul Retish for additions, revisions and editing.

January 15, 1975 - Final edited report submitted to Teacher Corps - Washington.

Appendix B

Memorandum to Study Team

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CULLEN BOULEVARD
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77004

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TEACHER CENTER

Memorandum to: Drs. Gene Hall, Bill Licata, Paul Retish

From: W. Robert Houston

Date: November 25, 1974

Attached is the brief description we discussed on the telephone. Will talk with you Wednesday and hope to hear from you withjn a few days.

jcc
enclosure

cc: Dr. James Steffensen

University of Iowa

The basic purpose of this visitation is to advise Teacher Corps - Washington of the advantages-disadvantages of funding a planning year in conjunction with a Teacher Corps project.

Iowa received such a grant. During the first year (1973-74), no interns were assigned, with 20 being inducted in June, 1974. With a year to plan for these interns rather than the typical two months, what advantages accrued? What disadvantages? The task of this visitation team is to visit the project, interview as many persons as possible, examine reports, and draw implications for other projects. We should (a) draw conclusions and (b) provide data which formed the basis for conclusions. This should provide a basis for decisioning relative to funding other such projects. This is not a site visit in the typical sense; it is not an evaluation of the Iowa project; it does draw from the Iowa project so as to consider replication.

Iowa Project

I visited with Paul Retish and James Steffensen in St. Louis recently. These are some notes from that meeting. I plan to share these with Paul, so he may wish to clarify any misconceptions I have. Paul's background, by the way, is in special education.

The project is a bilingual, bicultural, elementary education project. Of the 20 interns who entered in June, 1974, after the staff had had nine months planning time, 19 are still in the program.

The program is located in four communities:

-Davenport - urban; chicano; railroad workers long established in community
-West Liberty - rural; chicano; monolingual
-Muscateen - urban; rural; chicano; monolingual
-Columbus Junction - urban; workers in a turkey processing plant.

Classes are taught in these communities which are from 20-65 miles from Iowa City. Classes are taught in the field; none on the Iowa University campus. Three centers have teaching centers. All instructors are full-time, regular IU faculty; no graduate assistants.

The IU College of Education includes seven divisions, which are relatively independent. Special education is one such division, and in the Teacher Corps project, special education modules are imbedded in regular modules.

Some of the things Paul mentioned which we may wish to consider as factors are:

-Faculty planning time for curriculum change
-Teaching Centers - teaching off-campus and in schools
-Extent to which this project impacted IU--institutional change
-Extent to which this project impacted faculty
-Agency cooperation--LEA, IHE--getting them to talk on a gut level
-Time required for inter-institutional cooperation to evolve
-Organization - developing teacher centers, materials, daily responsibilities such as housekeeping and who is responsible
-Advisory Board

Institutions involved and some targets of the process include (a) IU (curriculum change, getting seven divisions together, grading, courses, management, evaluating faculty, course load); (b) four school districts (understanding what contract meant, parents advisory, community relations); and (c) joint county education office (special education).

The whole notion of institutional change and inter-institutional cooperation seems an important consideration. But we need to consider as many of the factors as possible involved in getting a project going. Planning includes a whole range of activities--community understanding of portal schools, setting institutional goals, time trade-offs. How much effort goes into planning? What time line was required? Could it be

shortened? Should it be shortened? What trade-offs in a restricted time line?

The project has had an historian and a log of activities.

In the visitation I suggest, we (1) read the log, and (2) visit with individuals and small groups (perhaps the latter is more effective of interview conducted over a longer time frame). Persons who may have perspective for team are: Dean of college; Chairman of seven divisions; faculty who have worked on and not worked on the project; school superintendents, principals, and teachers; interns; community representatives; Advisory Board.

Prior to the visit, I suggest we identify a set of classes of questions, data, and perceptions we wish to address ourselves to. These should be drawn from our experience with Teacher Corps, institutional change, and project management.

To facilitate this, I suggest that each of us mail to other team members his suggestions for topics or areas to probe and possible ways to elicit these data, and that a conference call be arranged among us at a mutually satisfactory time. The purpose would be to make some tentative plans for the visit.

Second, I would suggest the team arrive in Iowa City (or whatever Paul would suggest) so as to meet together and with Paul on the evening prior to the first interviews. Some time should be scheduled in each site if possible and at the university. If time restricts us, one or two sites may not be visited or the period shortened. Two full days will likely be required.

Following the visit, the report of the team needs to be coordinated in such a way to make sense to readers and to accurately reflect the purpose of the visit. At this point, I would suggest the following format:

I. Purpose of report (brief)

II. Summary of Conclusions, drawing implications from an extended planning period (listed positive and negative trade-offs--any summary remarks). Recommendations.

III. Brief overview and history of the project, institutions involved, and program emphases (Paul may already have such a document or could provide one, but may be necessary to uninitiated reader).

IV. Supporting data for conclusions, providing background and elaborations; providing the reader with more information on each conclusion (this section could be keyed to conclusions).

V. Appendices, documentation, speculation or other information related to the visit.

(a) my memo,
(b) criteria-expectations,
(c) who interviewed, how project undertaken; procedures,
(d) timeline-student.

Muscatine-Scott County School System
2604 West Locust Street
Davenport, Iowa 52804

MSCSS

Dr. Jerry B. Stout, Superintendent
Dr. Vernon L. Vance, Director

319 / 391-0400

Department of
Special Education

December 5, 1974

MEMO

TO: Cooperating Principals, Cooperating Teachers, Superintendents, Community Coordinators, Interns, Team Leaders and Community People

FROM: James Kay, LEA Coordinator, Teacher Corps

RE: On-site Visit: Dr. William Licata, Buffalo, N.Y.; Mr. Gene Hall, Austin, Texas; and Professor Robert Houston, Houston, Texas
Monday P.M., December 16th, 1974

An on-site visit has been scheduled by the three Teacher Corps consultants listed above. We have been asked to arrange visitations with all local Teacher Corps cooperating staffs, community people, and Teacher Corps personnel. The times and locations are listed below.

Davenport Site, Muscatine-Scott Central Office, 2604 W. Locust Street

1:30 - 3:00 Interns and Team Leader
3:00 - 4:00 Cooperating Principals, Teachers and Superintendents
4:00 - 5:00 Community Coordinator and Community People

Muscatine Site, Muscatine School District Office, 1403 Park Ave.

1:30 - 3:00 Interns and Team Leader
3:00 - 4:00 Cooperating Principals, Teachers and Superintendents
4:00 - 5:00 Community People

West Liberty Sites: #1 Community Center, 319 No. Calhoun
#2 Middle School, 806 No. Miller

1:30 - 3:00 Interns and Team Leaders from West Liberty and Columbus - Site #1
3:00 - 4:00 Cooperating Principals, Teachers and Superintendents, West Liberty and Columbus - Site #2
4:00 - 5:00 Community Coordinator and Community People, West Liberty and Columbus, Site #2

These on-site visitations are an integral part of each Teacher Corps project. May we encourage you to try to find time in your busy schedules to attend the session scheduled for you.

Appendix C

Indicators for Assessing the Planning Phase of Program Implementation

1. A description of the major activities within the program are described.
2. The major activities within the program are projected in terms of amounts of time and other resources that will be needed.
3. Personnel to be involved are identified. The identified personnel know what their tasks and responsibilities will be.
4. The identified personnel's teaching loads and assignments are allocated and assigned well in advance of beginning the program plans.
5. Students receive in advance of participating in the program an orientation that provides detailed illustrations, expectations and experiences rather than a more general descriptive kind of brochure.
6. The schools and teachers that will be involved in the program know early or in the preceding year that they will be involved.
7. Schools and teachers are directly involved in the early and ongoing planning.
8. The college faculty that will be involved are included in the initial and ongoing planning for "tool up".
9. Other faculty within the College of Education receive orientation materials or have meetings to keep them informed of the activities that are being planned.
10. Other faculty have ongoing opportunities to be involved as resource persons and know of this opportunity.
11. Individuals are assigned authority and responsibility for major tasks and these are well articulated in advance.
12. Instructional materials that will be needed for the program are identified in advance.
13. Instructional materials are ordered well enough in advance so that they will

be on hand in time for use.

14. Materials to be developed are fully developed during this "tool up" period.
15. Some of the materials developed during this "tool up" period are also trial tested prior to beginning of the actual program.
16. Faculty are involved in training experiences to provide them with additional skills for working within the program before the students arrive.
17. Student selection is completed well in advance of beginning of the program.
18. Announcements are made in a local media informing the community of the upcoming program.
19. Community members are regularly involved in the "tool up" process.
20. Community members due to direct involvement or involvement of peers have an ownership in the program.
21. The organizational hierarchy or structure that the program will work within itself is described well in advance and understood by all those directly involved.
22. The organizational structure between the program and the College of Education is described far enough in advance so that all understand it.
23. Facilities for operating the program are scheduled in advance.
24. Facilities are prepared for use before the students arrive.
25. Other professional and personal responsibilities including vacation times, teaching assignments are scheduled and planned so that they are on board and are ready to go with the arrival of the students or at another predesignated time.
26. The bureacracy within the university is "tooled up" and functioning in advance with regard to the processing of vouchers, administrative details,

assigning courses and establishing account numbers for operation of the program.

27. Policies with regard to responsibilities of students, assignments to and in accordance with schools are established in advance of the arrival of the students.
28. The policies have been worked out jointly with all of those involved prior to the students' arrival.
29. The development of these policies also include planned involvement of the students once they are on board.
30. Once selected, students are kept posted in newsletters or other kinds of contact of the development of the program rather than being left in isolation until they actually show up for the beginning day.
31. Regular faculty members are involved in the program rather than the program consisting of recruited new and part-time personnel.
32. Key administrators such as department chairmen and deans have been involved in the planning process and have been kept informed of the development of the program.
33. School-based administrators have also been informed and involved as the program has developed, preferably through regular attendance at planning meetings.
34. A game plan has been established plotting the steps that need to be taken in anticipation of arrival of the interns, identifying the various resources and steps that need to be tapped and coordinated.
35. Evaluation design, both formative and summative, within the program effort has been planned in advance with involvement of many, not just one or two people.
36. The evaluation plans' measures are in hand and exist prior to beginning of the program.

Indicators of Organized Pre-Planning That
Occur Once A Program is Underway

1. Students arrive with realistic expectations about the program and their role within the program.
2. Any evaluation activities that were planned such as administration of measures are administered on schedule.
3. There is minimal confusion of students about where they are to be at any particular time.
4. Instructional materials are on hand and ready for students.
5. Assignment of housing, the assignment of classrooms, and transportation are all worked out in advance or done with a minimum amount of difficulty due to need of the students to be there before these items could be finally decided.
6. The faculty members are on hand.
7. The college bureacracy processes--all forms and procedures ready.
8. The school personnel are prepared and ready to cooperate with the interns in the planned activities.
9. Kids in the schools have been set up to expect the arrival of the interns and are ready to incorporate them.
10. Uninvolved faculty within the college are aware of and know of the arrival and initiation of the program.

Appendix D

Areas to Consider in Assessing Planning

state university college at buffalo

THIRTEEN HUNDRED ELMWOOD AVENUE • BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14222 • AC 716-862-5012

DR WILLIAM LICATA, *Director*
Teacher Corps Programs

December 9, 1974

Dr. Robert Houston
9831 Vogue Avenue
Houston, Texas 77055

Dear Bob:

Enclosed are some thoughts and areas I've explored regarding the Iowa visit. As you can see they are organized to look at the L.E.A., College and Community.

I. Collaborative Decision Making

A. Steering committee

1. composition
2. involvement

B. L.E.A.

1. Selection process
2. Board selection of school
3. Preparation of building administrators
4. Orientation for cooperating teachers
5. Team leader selection and training
6. Committment
7. Teacher organization (orient)

DR ROBERT L ARENDS, *Associate Director*, Teacher Corps/Peace Corps
MRS HELEN W WAITE, *Associate Director*, Teacher Corps Buffalo
DR LEWIS J SINATRA, *Program Development Specialist*, Teacher Corps
MRS NANCY F PACE, *Administrative Assistant*, Teacher Corps

C. College - plan with administration for:

1. Staff involvement
2. facilities
3. program approval (institutional change)
4. College committment

D. Community

1. Support and approval
2. involvement in plan and material development
3. Community-based education component.

II. Materials Developed

A. Are they developed prior to intern involvement?

B. Who were the developers?

C. Quality

III. Intern Selection

A. Criteria

B. Were criteria met?

IV. Program Management and Assessment

These are very general and each of these areas certainly can solicit a variety of questions. The material received also generated many questions regarding grading, field testing of modules etc.

See you on Monday.

Sincerely,

William Licata

WL:mll

Appendix E

Materials Reviewed During Study.

Received from Dr. Retish in advance of visit:

1. "Teacher Corps The University of Iowa" 2pp. memo
2. "Education extended into the community: An addendum to Teacher Corps proposal for innovative education with major emphasis on bilingual minorities" 7pp. memo
3. "Teacher Corps Time Line" 1pg. memo
4. "Midwestern Teacher Corps Network Center A Proposal Amendment" Teacher Corp Project Cycle 8 University of Iowa, November 5, 1974 7pp. memo
5. Module 1.1 to 10.3 by William Matthes 28 pp. memo
6. "Module Cluster: Curriculum and Learning Theory" by Hood, September 24, 1974 8 pp. photo copy
7. "Module Cluster 6.8: Curriculum and Learning Theory" by Hood, August 16, 1974
8. "Hood's modules: Summary of Competencies met." 1 pp. photo copy
9. Teacher Corps The University of Iowa - Vol 1 No. 1 Oct. 73 5pp.
10. Teacher Corps The University of Iowa - Vol 1 No. 2 Nov. 73 4pp.
11. Teacher Corps The University of Iowa - Vol 1 No. 3 Dec. 73 4pp.
12. Teacher Corps The University of Iowa - Vol 1 No. 4 Apr. 74 4pp.
13. El Maestro - Teacher Corp Iowa City, by Julio Gratis 12 pp.

Materials Reviewed while at the University of Iowa.

1. Teacher Corps Proposal for Innovative Education with major emphasis on bilingual minorities. University of Iowa.
2. Teacher Corps Log by Richard Halrevson, Research Assistant 22 pp. typed.
3. News clippings about University of Iowa Teacher Corps - 5 major stories.

Appendix F

Interview Protocols

University Faculty

When did you first hear about the project? Get involved?

In what ways have you been involved? What have you accomplished as a result of the project? Writings? Conceptualizations? Interactions with school or community? Modules?

Were you on assigned or unassigned time on the project? Advantages? Disadvantages? Relations with other faculty as a result?

How widespread is faculty understanding of the Teacher Corps project? Faculty support?

What has been done to elicit faculty support?

To what extent did you know what was expected of you?

Were you involved in planning the project? Planning your role? Working with others in planning? Time line of such participation?

Were you involved in orientation sessions? Training sessions? Conferences? When were they conducted? To what extent have they influenced your contributions?

Were you able to develop materials for interns prior to beginning training? In what ways were they different from what you had been teaching? What innovations introduced? New modules, materials, resources? Tailored for Teacher Corps project?

Materials prepared or ordered prior to intern training? Competencies delineated? Opportunity to pilot test materials? Revise them?

What is you perception of the general quality of the Teacher Corps training program? In what ways was an extended planning period related to this?

From your perspective, what are the tradeoffs of an extended planning period?

University Dean and Associate Dean

1. In assigning faculty to the project, did the extended time-line generated from planning permit more effective assignments? Time to confer with faculty to determine interests and commitment? What about fall, 1973 where grant announcement came as school opened?

2. Did the project allow assignment of regular faculty? What budget reallocation occurred as a result? What are benefits? Concerns?

3. For new programs, what administrative or faculty approval processes must be followed? What is the time-line for these?

4. Have any administratives or organizational innovations resulted from this project? Explain. Related to Planning period?

5. What procedures were used to make faculty aware of project? Outcomes of efforts? Was increased time a factor?

6. In what ways has the Teacher Corps project changed the College of Education? Relationship with schools?

7. From your perspective, what are the trade-offs of a year of planning?

Project Administrators

Was a time-line of activities plotted out? When? How effective? To what extent used? Regular planning meetings?

Who was involved in plotting time-line? School personnel? University? Community?

Was an evaluation design for the program plotted out? By whom? During planning period? What accomplished? To what extent used?

Can you judge faculty-staff productivity during the planning period? For those on assigned time? Unassigned time? Fall, 1973 assignments were made late; how many continued on project the second semester?

How extensive was participation during planning period? Unassigned faculty? School officials? Community?

Were intern recruitment brochures written Fall, 1973? Program descriptions?

What activities did you engage in to elicit assistance and expertise from outside Iowa? From other Teacher Corps projects? Modules? Materials? Bilingual ideas and resources?

What impact has the project had on the university? How have you gone about obtaining commitment from faculty, university, schools, community?

How and from whom did the original proposal come?

How was Steering Committee selected? Involved? Active during the planning period?

This year, what evidence is there that a longer planning period helped make the program more effective?

Who represented the project at conferences and training opportunities during the planning period? How are they involved during implementation?

What programmatic or organizational innovations accrued as a result? Did having an extended planning period provide time to have faculty participate in training opportunities?

What are you able to do this year as a result of an extended planning period that likely could not have occurred with a shorter planning period?

From your perspective, what are the trade-offs of an extended planning period?

INTERNS:

When did you first learn about Teacher Corps?

The program? When did you apply?

How? When accepted?

Why select Iowa?

What information received in advance of arrival?

How well did you know what was expected?

How detailed was program description?

What kind of changes were made in first couple of weeks from what announced?

Schools know you were coming?

Arrangements worked out?

From your perspective, what are trade-offs of a year of planning?
(15 month vs. 2 years)

School Teachers and Principals

When and how did you first learn about Teacher Corps?

What activities occurred between then and summer?

Orientation sessions?

Knowledge of Teacher Corps program?

How much input did you have in planning it?

How much do other faculty know about program?

How much support?

How were you selected?

When?

How feel about waiting a year to get an intern?

Did you participate in intern selection?

Setting criteria?

From your perspective, what are trade-offs of a year of planning?

Community Representatives

When did you first hear of the Teacher Corps project? From whom? How?

In what ways have you been involved? Advisory Committee? What have you contributed to the project? How much time involved?

To what extent is the Community knowledgeable about the project? Committed to it?

Were you involved in any way in planning for the project? Have you worked with school or university people? When? In what ways?

What community agencies have been involved with the project?

From your perspective what are the advantages and disadvantages of a nine-month planning period?